94-2

94th Congress
2d Session

COMMITTEE PRINT

MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

REPORT OF THE SENATE DELEGATION ON THE SIXTEENTH MEETING, HELD AT ATLANTA, GEORGIA

BY

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Chairman

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA LIBRARIES
SEP 1976
DOCUMENTS DEPT.

AUGUST 1976

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
75-104 WASHINGTON : 1976

SENATE DELEGATION

MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana, *Chairman*

GALE W. McGEE, Wyoming
LEE METCALF, Montana
JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, New Mexico
FLOYD K. HASKELL, Colorado
WALTER D. HUDDLESTON, Kentucky
ROBERT MORGAN, North Carolina
JOHN A. DURKIN, New Hampshire

CHARLES H. PERCY, Illinois
PAUL J. FANNIN, Arizona
PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico
PAUL LAXALT, Nevada

ROBERT H. DOCKERY, *Staff Consultant*

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of Transmittal	v
I. Background	1
II. Conference program	2
III. Committee reports	4
A. Committee I—Political Affairs	4
B. Committee II—Economic and Social Affairs	6
IV. Joint statement by heads of delegations	14
Appendixes:	
A. Welcoming statement by the Hon. George Busbee, Governor of Georgia	19
B. Opening plenary session statement by Representative E "Kika" de la Garza	21
C. Closing plenary session statement by Senator Mike Mansfield	23
D. Financial statement	25

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/mexistat00unit

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

AUGUST 13, 1976.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President Pro Tempore,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In accordance with Public Law 86–420, approved April 9, 1960, I am transmitting herewith a report on the 16th meeting of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, which was held in Atlanta, Georgia, and Denver, Colorado, February 25–29, 1976.

Once again it was my pleasure to serve as Chairman of the Senate delegation. This is an honor which has been bestowed on me for a number of years and it is one which I have thoroughly enjoyed. With my retirement from the Senate at the end of this year, I shall surely miss participating in these annual conferences.

As I have said before, the United States has no better friend in the world than Mexico. I am proud that our annual interparliamentary conferences with Mexico shall forever stand as a glowing testament to that friendship.

Sincerely,

MIKE MANSFIELD,
Chairman, Senate Delegation.

SIXTEENTH MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE

I. Background

United States participation in annual parliamentary conferences with Mexico was authorized by Public Law 86–420, approved April 9, 1960. The first such conference was held in Guadalajara in February, 1961. Subsequent conferences have been held in the United States in even-numbered years and in Mexico in odd-numbered years.

The United States delegates attending the 16th Conference, which was held in Atlanta, Georgia, February 26–27, 1976, were:

From the Senate

Mike Mansfield of Montana, Chairman.
Joseph M. Montoya of New Mexico.
Robert Morgan of North Carolina.
John A. Durkin of New Hampshire.

From the House of Representatives

E (Kika) de la Garza of Texas, Chairman.
Lester L. Wolff of New York.
Jerome A. Ambro of New York.
Manuel Lujan, Jr., of New Mexico.
John H. Rousselot of California.
Clair W. Burgener of California.
Robert J. Lagomarsino of California.
Benjamin A. Gilman of New York.

Senator Enrique Olivares Santana served as Chairman of the Mexican delegation. Deputy Luis Danton Rodriguez was Co-Chairman of the Mexican delegation. The other Mexican delegates were:

From the Senate

Ramon Alcala Ferrera of Campeche.
Victor Manzanilla Schaffer of Yucatan.
Aurora Ruvalcaba Gutierrez of Colima.
Enrique Gonzalez Pedrero of Tabasco.
Carlos Perez Camara.
Francisco Aguilar Hernandez of Morelos.
Guillermo Morales Blumenkron of Puebla.
Ignacio Maciel Salcedo of Jalisco.
Edgar Robledo Santiago of Chiapas.
German Corona del Rosal of Hidalgo.
Gilberto Suarez Torres of Oaxaca.
Jose Bruno del Rio (Alternate).
Vicente Juarez Carro (Alternate).

From the Chamber of Deputies

Alejandro Sobarzo Loaiza of Sonora.
Antonio Martinez Baez of Michaocan.
Rogelio Garcia Gonzalez of Veracruz.
Francisco Javier Gutierrez Villarreal of Nuevo Leon.
Jose de Jesus Martinez Gil of the Federal District.
Luis Adolfo Santibanez Belmont of the Federal District.
Mario Ruiz de Chavez Garcia of the State of Mexico.
Pedro Guillen Castanon of Chiapas.
Antonio Carrillo Huacuja of Baja California.
Teodoro Carrasco Palacios of Oaxaca.
Jose Milrat (alternate).

II. Conference Program

The Mexican delegation arrived at Andrews Air Force Base at 2:00 P.M., February 25, where it was received by members of the United States delegation. Both delegations then proceeded directly to the White House, where President Ford delivered a brief welcoming address following an informal reception. At 4:30 P.M. that same afternoon, both delegations flew to Dobbins Air Force Base, Atlanta, Georgia, arriving at approximately 6:00 P.M., and proceeded immediately to the Regency Hyatt Hotel in downtown Atlanta, where the official conference sessions took place.

The opening plenary session of the Conference was held the following morning in the Falcon Room of the Regency Hyatt Hotel. This session included a welcoming address by the Honorable George Busbee, Governor of Georgia, and introductory remarks by Hon. E. (Kika) de la Garza, Acting Chairman of the House delegation and Deputy Rodriguez, Co-Chairman of the Mexican delegation. Immediately thereafter, the delegates proceeded to their respective committee meetings, which were held throughout the remainder of the day. On the morning of February 27, the delegates finished their committee work and in the afternoon they attended the closing session of the Conference which included closing remarks by the Hon. Mike Mansfield, Chairman of the Senate delegation, and Senator Enrique Olivares Santana, Chairman of the Mexican delegation. That evening, delegates attended a dinner at the Fairmont Hotel in Atlanta which was followed by a special Bicentennial performance.

Both delegations departed Dobbins Air Force Base early the next morning and arrived at Buckly National Guard Field, Denver, Colorado, at 11:00 A.M. After an informal brunch at the Brown Palace Hotel in downtown Denver, members of both delegations had the opportunity to take a bus trip to Vail which was climaxed by a final dinner at the Eagle's Nest restaurant.

At 2:00 P.M. on February 29, members of the United States delegations departed Buckly Field for their return to Washington, arriving at Andrews Air Force Base at approximately 6:00 P.M.

The work of the Conference was organized in two Committees which dealt with the following agenda items:

A. Committee I—Political Affairs

1. Bilateral Relations.
2. Views on the United Nations.
3. Changes in the Organization of American States.
   (a) Amendments to the Rio Treaty.
4. Efforts to Control Traffic in Narcotics.
5. Law of the Sea.
   (a) Exclusive Economic Zones.
6. Protection of Human Rights.
7. Democracy in the Western Hemisphere.

B. Committee II—Economic and Social Affairs

1. Inflation and Development.
   (a) Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.
2. Trade, Tourism, and the Balance-of-Payments.
3. Implementation of the Trade Reform Act of 1974.
4. Integration and Regional Economic Development.
5. Migratory Workers and Illegal Aliens.
6. Education, Science and Culture.

The Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conferences do not take votes or pass resolutions, but in most years the chiefs of delegations have issued a joint statement. The statement issued in Atlanta this year is printed elsewhere in this report, as are the reports on the discussions held in each of the two committees.

There follows the rules of procedure adopted annually by the Conference:

1. The United States co-chairman will designate a United States delegate to serve as chairman of each committee.

2. Each delegation will name a delegate for each committee to serve as official rapporteurs.

3. In each committee the Mexican rapporteur and the United States rapporteur will prepare a summary of the principal points and arguments made by the delegates of his country in that committee. Each summary will be included in the record of the meetings.

4. All meetings will start at the designated hour regardless of the number of delegates present. If the chairman is not present, a delegate designated by the chairman will call the meeting to order.

5. To assure maximum participation the chairman will recognize alternately members of each delegation in the order in which they indicate a desire to speak.

6. In order that as many delegates as wish may participate, a delegate may not speak for more than 10 minutes until each delegate who wishes to speak has had his opportunity.

7. A delegate who has been recognized shall not be called to order or interrupted during the time allotted him.

8. A delegate may participate in the discussion of a committee other than the one to which he is assigned in the same manner as a delegate assigned to the committee.

9. No votes will be taken.

10. It will be in the discretion of the chairman to determine that a subject has been discussed sufficiently and to recommend proceeding to the next subject.

75-104—76——2

11. The opening and concluding plenary sessions will be open to the press and the public, and a stenographic record will be made. All committee sessions will be limited to the delegates and to staff attached to each of the two delegations. In order to assure the maximum expression of views, it is understood that discussions in the committees will be considered as private and not for publication.

12. It is requested that delegates and staff wear their badges when attending meetings and other functions.

III. Committee Reports

A. COMMITTEE I—POLITICAL AFFAIRS

The United States members of the Political Affairs Committee were Senators Mansfield and Durkin and Representatives de la Garza (Chairman), Wolff, Ambro, Burgener and Gilman.

The committee's deliberations encompassed the seven agenda items assigned to it, beginning with an overview of bilateral relations between the United States and Mexico. On this subject, there was virtually complete agreement that, on a one-to-one basis, Mexico-United States relations are "good" if not excellent. On a broader basis, however, there are considerable differences because, as a member of the Mexican delegation observed, the United States has global interests, political, economic and military, and Mexico does not.

A member of the United States delegation commented in response that, though Mexico's foreign policy interests may not be as broadly gaged as those of the United States, Mexico is an acknowledged leader of the Third World.

The committee then turned its attention to the next agenda item, the status of the United Nations. Members of the United States delegation expressed their concern that the U.N. Charter was being undermined and that disruptive practices and procedures engaged in by some could well lead to the destruction of the United Nations as an institution designed to safeguard world peace and security. A spokesman for the Mexican delegation pointed out that the developing countries have control of the United Nations and that it is incumbent on all nations which believe in democratic principles to accept their application in the functioning of the United Nations.

In the course of discussing this issue, the Mexican delegation was asked about Cuba's intervention in Angola. A member of the Mexican delegation responded by stating that the principle of non-intervention serves as the foundation of Mexican foreign policy and that accordingly, Mexico opposes intervention in the internal affairs of one country by another.

The interrelated issues of the Organization of American States and proposed amendments to the Rio Treaty were reviewed in detail by a member of the Mexican delegation. This review made it clear that within the Hemisphere there are considerable differences of opinion on such matters as ideological pluralism, sovereignty over natural resources and collective economic security. For example, Mexico is a strong supporter of the idea that collective economic security is vital to the peace and well being of the Hemisphere. The United States on the other hand has, in connection with the proposed amendments to the Rio Treaty, expressed certain reservations on this issue. As for

the Treaty itself, Mexico does not regard it as a military pact but rather as an agreement which creates an alliance for cooperation.

A member of the United States delegation summarized his views on the OAS and the U.N. by saying that both organizations need a lot of revision.

The committee turned its attention next to cooperative efforts between the United States and Mexico to control traffic in narcotic drugs. Both delegations expressed the view that major efforts are being made by Mexican and United States officials charged with interdicting the flow and eliminating the supply of illicit narcotics. Similarly, both delegations praised President Echeverria's proposal calling for the establishment of parallel national commissions to oversee the efforts being made to curtail drug traffic between the United States and Mexico. Despite these efforts, the two delegations also agreed that more would have to be done by both countries in order to reduce the impact and magnitude of the problem.

The committee's consideration of the law of the sea issue focused on (1) efforts within the United Nations to reach an international consensus on a comprehensive law of the sea agreement and (2) national legislation creating or establishing 200-mile exclusive fishery and/or economic zones. Both delegations expressed the hope that the United Nations committee on the law of the sea would be able to finish its work this year by reaching agreement on all outstanding law of the sea issues, including the breadth of the territorial sea, transit through straits, conservation and protection of living resources and the marine environment and exploration and exploitation of deep-seabed areas.

A member of the Mexican delegation reported on his country's decision to create a 200-mile exclusive economic zone. It was pointed out that, while the Mexican Government will exercise sovereignty with respect to exploration and exploitation within the zone, it would be a serious mistake to equate the zone with an extension of the territorial sea. Mexico views its offshore economic zone as a means of enhancing national development efforts. Members of the United States delegation agreed that the United States is moving in the direction of accepting the exclusive economic zone concept, as evidenced by legislation in Congress calling for the creation of a 200-mile fishery zone. However, there was disagreement among the members of the U.S. delegation on the desirability of such a zone.

The subject of human rights brought forth expressions of concern about the treatment of Americans in jail in Mexico and the detention of Mexican aliens in the United States. It was agreed that every country has a clear-cut responsibility to protect fundamental human rights and that no nation has a monopoly on the desire to safeguard individual rights and freedoms. Both delegations agreed that all nations can do better in implementing the U.N. Declaration on Human Rights.

The committee completed its work with a brief but intense discussion on democracy in the Western Hemisphere and democratic institutions in general. The Committee's views on these issues are summarized in the Joint Statement:

> Both delegations agreed that democracy and the functioning of democratic institutions are the best social and political means to guarantee the freedom and rights of man, since they constitute the most effective way to halt the advance of totalitarianism.

Similarly, both delegations expressed their firm hope for the reestablishment of representative democracy and democratic institutions in those countries where they have been suppressed.

B. COMMITTEE II—ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS

The United States members of the Economic and Social Affairs Committee were Senators Montoya (Chairman) and Morgan and Representatives Lujan, Rousselot and Lagomarsino.

The six agenda topics assigned to the Committee were discussed at considerable length by all delegates who participated in the meetings. A summary of the highlights of these discussions follows.

Inflation and Development

The meeting opened with comments by the Mexican Chairman* about the effects of worldwide inflation on Mexico's economy.

The Chairman noted that price increases in other countries, particularly in the United States, have had an adverse effect on Mexico's balance of payments. (Mexico, it was pointed out, was the fourth largest recipient of U.S. exports.) While the developed countries could absorb the effects of a recession, he observed, the developing countries could not. Mexico particularly feared the possibility of a worldwide depression which could bring massive unemployment. Mexico has proposed that all countries achieve a more equitable international economic system and a stable world economy as set forth in the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States (discussed below); it also recommended the conclusion of long-term multilateral commodity agreements which would take both producers' and consumers' interests into account.

The Mexican Chairman then summarized some of the economic achievements Mexico had realized over the past five years. These included: (a) the irrigation of one million hectares of land, increased fertilization which had produced a surplus in beans and rice, and a reduction of the corn deficit by 10% of consumption, (b) the doubling of petroleum production to more than 830,000 barrels per day, and (c) the inclusion of approximately 30% of the total population in the educational system and the construction of 60,000 public housing units.

A United States delegate responded to these remarks by noting that the United States had an equivalent interest in improving economic conditions throughout the world and in raising the standard of living. The United States, he pointed out, had not been as fortunate as Mexico in making recent oil strikes and its dependency on foreign sources of petroleum products had, if anything, increased during 1974–75. This dependency had, in fact, heightened U.S. awareness of the interdependence of the world's economies, not only within the

*The Mexican Chairman of Committee II also served as co-chairman of the Mexican delegation. Further references in this section to the respective "Chairmen" are meant to apply to Committee II exclusively.

Western Hemisphere but in other regions. The United States was committed to helping the developing nations establish and maintain world markets for their products, as evidenced by the major U.S. contribution to the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

Attention was called to Secretary Kissinger's September 1, 1975 address to the Seventh Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly in which proposals were advanced to:

> Improve developing countries' access to capital markets, to adapt new technology to specific development needs;
>
> Improve the opportunities in the world trading system so that LDC's [Less Developed Countries] can "make their way by earnings instead of aid";
>
> Improve conditions of trade and investment in key commodities on which the LDC's depend;
>
> Safeguard against economic shocks to which the LDC's are particularly vulnerable; and
>
> Address the needs of the poorest countries, which are most affected by current economic conditions.

Within the context of bilateral exchange of goods and services, a United States delegate suggested the possibility of negotiating long-term agreements which would include crude oil exports to the United States in exchange for firm commitments on the importation of certain key Mexican products. In response to this suggestion, a Mexican delegate noted that although recent discoveries of oil deposits in Southeastern Mexico were regarded as significant, they were not on the scale of the "Middle East". Mexico hoped, however, to be in a position to make progressively greater exports of crude oil in the future.

Considerable discussion was devoted to recent developments in Mexico's Border Industry Program. This was a program initiated by Mexico in 1965 as a means of alleviating the chronic high unemployment in the Mexican cities on the U.S. border. As of January 1975, there were almost 550 plants employing some 85,000 persons, but owing to the U.S. economic slowdown, reduced consumer demand in the U.S. and increased wages and operating costs in Mexico, border industries had declined during this past year.

A Mexican delegate indicated that it was the official Mexican position that border factories and assembly plants in Mexico did *not* generate unemployment in the United States. A United States delegate responded that that had also been the conclusion of those agencies of the United States Government which had investigated the matter. For instance, in 1969, former President Nixon had asked the U.S. Tariff Commission to investigate the impact of items 806.30 and 807.00 on the U.S. economy. The Commission concluded that repeal of these two items "would not markedly reduce the volume of imports of the articles that now enter the U.S. under these provisions. Rather, these articles would continue to be supplied from abroad . . . but in many cases with fewer or no U.S. components . . ."

In other words, as a United States delegate pointed out, the United States officially favored the continuance of the border industry (or "twin plants") program. The decrease in the level of activity during 1975 as compared with 1974 was based on: (a) decreased demand in the U.S. as a result of the recession and (b) higher costs in Mexico. It was not the result of a conscious retrenchment policy on the part of the U.S. Government.

In his opening statement, the Mexican Chairman observed that the Charter proposal, while originally an initiative of President Luis Echeverria, had subsequently been adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 12, 1974. In essence it was a proposal to remove the concept of economic cooperation from the area of good-will and to establish it in the field of international law. The government of Mexico considered the Charter to be a declaration of human rights for all men as well as all nations. To agree to its spirit represented progress; at the same time, Mexico realized that implementation of this idea would take time.

In responding to these remarks, several United States delegates noted that the original negotiations had produced a draft Charter, most of whose articles were agreed upon by the United States. United States objections had only been raised to specific articles dealing with foreign investment and expropriation, primary commodities, producer cartels, indexation of prices and similar provisions. It had been the hope of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations that amendments advanced by some dozen industrialized democracies could have been accepted by the Assembly to ensure universal adherence to the Charter. Unfortunately, this did not occur.

In this connection, the United States chairman pointed out that there was growing concern among the United States electorate over recent moves by foreign governments to expropriate U.S. property without payment of adequate compensation. As a result, Congress was unlikely to approve any international agreements which did not contain specific guarantees for foreign investment. More was involved than the fortunes of large corporations; the economic security of thousands of individual shareholders was also at stake. In this regard, Mexico was cited as a model of international responsibility, since past nationalization actions of the Mexican government had always been accompanied by payment of fair compensation. Thus, it was emphasized, U.S. reservations about certain Charter provisions (as finally enacted by the General Assembly) was by no means directed at Mexico.

At the request of the Mexican legislators, members of the United States delegation participating in Committee II proceedings agreed to discuss with the Executive Branch of the United States Government the desirability of implementing those provisions of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States which both Governments favor.

Trade, Tourism and the Balance of Payments

A Mexican delegate underlined the importance of tourism to Mexico's overall development. Not only did tourism bring in needed foreign exchange, but it also generated jobs and facilitated regional development. Moreover, income from tourism and border transactions has financed Mexico's trade deficit to an increasing extent in recent years.

In 1975, however, certain negative trends were noted in the flow of tourists from the United States, which accounted for 85% of the Mexican market. Economic conditions in the United States restricted the number of U.S. tourists to Mexico and reduced the average rate

of disbursement. This downward trend became evident in the second half of 1974, when the tourist growth rate began to level off—leading to an absolute decline in tourism by early 1975. At the same time, travel by Mexicans abroad (95% of which was directed to the United States) increased substantially.

To counteract these trends, Mexico has initiated programs to promote domestic tourism and to become competitive in international tourism. An attempt has been made to guarantee quality and prices in conformance with current market conditions; investment in new facilities in the Mexican Caribbean, on the Pacific Coast and in Baja California has been increased; and training of personnel has been accelerated. Finally, a National Fund for the Promotion of Tourism was established to provide enterprises with technical and financial assistance.

Several United States delegates observed that Mexico remained a country of very considerable interest to American tourists—particularly from such states as Texas, New Mexico and California. In this connection two United States delegates from the state of New Mexico stressed the importance of establishing regular flights between Albuquerque and Mexico City. While this proposal has received the official endorsement of the U.S. Government, approval by the Mexican authorities was still pending. These delegates noted that such an air link should be of great benefit to Mexico which was the favorite foreign destination of travellers from New Mexico. It was hoped that progress along this line would be achieved in the current civil aviation negotiations on a new agreement to replace the 1973 accord.

Another United States delegate summarized some of the positive and negative factors, which, in the U.S. view, had affected the Mexican tourism industry during 1975. Foremost among the latter was the economic recession in the United States, which clearly resulted in less foreign travel by Americans than would otherwise have been the case. Mexico's support of the so-called "Zionism" resolution in the United Nations had also had an adverse impact, as had the lack of competitiveness in air fares between the United States and Mexico in comparison with other international or national routes. On the other hand, Mexico's decision to rescind the 15% restaurant tax for foreign visitors had been a most welcome development.

It was the consensus of both delegations that serious consideration should be given to increasing the current $100 customs exemption for returning U.S. residents. This exemption, which compared with an approximate exemption of $640 granted by Mexico to its residents returning from the United States, had—it was felt—become diluted by inflation and should be adjusted upward. Although bills calling for an increase in the U.S. customs exemption had been introduced in the Congress, no action had yet been taken by the House Ways and Means Committee which had original jurisdiction over such legislation.

Implementation of the Trade Reform Act of 1974

General apprehension was conveyed by several Mexican delegates over restrictions contained in the 1974 Act which, if strictly implemented, could serve as an impediment to the economic expansion of the developing nations. Particular concern was expressed over the General System of (tariff) Preferences (GSP) embodied in Title V of the act which, it was feared, would apply to only a fraction of Mexican

exports. Moreover, it was pointed out, the products excepted from the GSP system, such as textiles, footwear, electronic parts, steel and glass, were those in which Mexico enjoyed competitive manufacturing facilities.

Within this context, members of the Mexican delegation focussed special attention on the applicability of certain non-tariff restrictions, such as import quotas, affecting many agricultural products of which Mexico was the only and chief supplier. Specific reference was made to cotton and tomatoes, products which were presently dutiable and exports of which were being severely curtailed. The Mexican position on this subject, it was pointed out, had been summarized in a diplomatic note presented to the Department of State last November by the Mexican Ambassador in Washington to which a response had not yet been received.

Finally, Mexican delegates who spoke on this topic urged that a more precise definition be agreed upon by both governments of the circumstances under which claims of dumping and unfair competition could be made and that measures be undertaken to assist Mexico in reducing its formidable and mounting trade deficit.

Responding to these points, a United States delegate noted that trade between the two countries was not a one-way street and that the impact of Mexico's import protection system on United States suppliers was not insignificant. For instance, lemon oil produced in the state of California (a product which does not compete with Mexican domestic production) as well as fresh and canned deciduous fruits have been consistently excluded from the Mexican market. In 1974, moreover, American-produced beef, dairy products and quarterhorses were subjected to high tariff rates, which were subsequently modified to some extent in 1975.

The Mexican government's licensing system also presented a serious obstacle to United States exporters. Under current regulations, all agricultural exports from the United States were subject to licensing and the importation of consumer goods has been prohibited. In effect, this meant that only industrial products, which were not available in Mexico, were getting through—often after considerable delay and uncertainty which the licensing process inevitably entailed.

An additional problem for U.S. exporters was the Mexican pricing structure—whereby the official price has been set higher than the invoice price and resulted in higher *de facto* tariff rates. In the light of all these considerations, this delegate concluded, an easing of import restrictions on a wide variety of products, while clearly desirable, would have to be effected on a reciprocal basis if it was to receive the necessary level of congressional support.

Other members of the United States delegation emphasized some of the advantages afforded by the GSP provisions of the trade act—both to Latin America in general and to Mexico in particular. Had GSP been in effect in 1974, over one billion dollars of Latin American exports to the U.S. would have been eligible for duty free treatment. This represented 75% of total exports to the United States as compared with the 67% of such exports which actually entered the country duty-free. In the case of Mexico, over 900 products totalling 500 million dollars which Mexico exported on a dutiable basis in 1974 would enter duty free under GSP—in addition to the one billion dollars which actually entered without duty that year. Moreover, the

GSP program provided for a broad expansion of product coverage and increased access by Latin American countries to the U.S. market. The inclusion of such provisions in the 1974 act was, in fact, a noteworthy achievement during a period of abnormally high unemployment within the United States.

Integration and Regional Economic Development

Mexican efforts to promote a common Latin American economic policy were set forth in a paper presented by a Mexican delegate, which focussed particular attention on the recent emergence of the Latin American Economic System (SELA). SELA, it was pointed out, had been a year-long Mexican initiative, leading ultimately to the adoption of the organization's Charter on October 17, 1975 by representatives of twenty-three Latin American countries, including Cuba. The first formal meeting of SELA had been held in Caracas in January, 1976 with a second meeting scheduled for April of this year.

SELA's structure, this delegate emphasized, was intended to be "pragmatic and flexible" and to provide a major impetus to regional or subregional economic efforts without impairing commitments derived from current treaties. SELA's function, he said, was to complement and strengthen, not duplicate or displace, existing institutions and agreements. An important feature of SELA was its universal composition: participation by *all* Latin American states was, in fact, specifically provided for.

The most significant objectives of SELA were cited as the following:

To accelerate regional development through the process of economic integration;

To improve cooperation among producer nations in order to maintain stable prices of primary commodities;

To rationalize human, technological and financial resources on a regional basis; and

To fill the urgent need for an exclusively Latin American forum in which these common interests may be discussed and to provide a better mechanism for collective efforts among Latin American nations.

In the Mexican view, therefore, SELA was conceived of as an institution of multinational cooperation, not confrontation, and should be regarded in that light.

In reply to these comments, a United States delegate noted that the need for regional economic development was by no means limited to the nations of Latin America, but also applied to his own state of New Mexico. The ultimate goal of any such regional policy, he said, was the free movement of goods across national and international borders—a policy which, although highly desirable, has proven difficult at times to implement. The United States nevertheless recognized the importance of this effort and officially favored the concept of regional development. An economically strengthened Latin America meant a stronger Western Hemisphere—a basic U.S. objective.

Members of the United States delegation particularly welcomed assurances by the Mexican legislators that SELA was designed as a mechanism for enhanced cooperation, not divisiveness, among all nations of the Hemisphere.

Migratory workers and illegal aliens

In opening discussion of this subject, a Mexican delegate recalled that the Organization of American States (OAS) at its 10th regular meeting held in Mexico City in 1974 had adopted the term "non-documented migratory worker" as being preferable to the designation "illegal immigrant" or "alien". The purpose of that language change, he said, was to reaffirm the principle that *work*—and the attempt to earn a livelihood by productive labor—was a fundamental human right. Such labor, he pointed out, was inherently "legal", whereas the manner in which it was carried out was clearly subject to national regulation.

This interpretation received the strong endorsement of all members of the United States delegation. Those delegates, representing such geographically diverse states as North Carolina, New Mexico and California, noted that Mexican workers were highly regarded for their willingness and industriousness and that they have made a major contribution to the development of the U.S. economy. One United States delegate pointed out in this connection that Mexican labor in the United States was by no means confined to agriculture, as was popularly believed. On the contrary, official statistics confirmed that over two-thirds of the migratory work force returning to Mexico from the United States had been engaged in *non*-agricultural pursuits.

Both delegations took note of the work of the two national commissions which had been established in Mexico and the United States to study the undocumented migratory worker problem following the October 21, 1974 meeting between President Ford and President Luis Echeverria.

At that meeting, President Echeverria had expressed the view that a long-range solution to the problem depended primarily on the improvement of economic conditions in Mexico. A Mexican delegate pointed out, for instance, that major reasons for Mexican emigration were: (1) population pressures within Mexico; (2) relative unproductivity of Mexican agricultural land; and (3) higher salaries in the United States. Moreover, he noted that such emigration often worked to Mexico's disadvantage because it resulted in the loss of the better qualified and more productive Mexican workers to industrial centers in the United States.

It was the consensus of the United States delegates who participated in the discussion of this topic that while the above observations were certainly valid for the longer term, conclusion of a new "Bracero" agreement would be desirable in the short term. Such a program, it was felt, although admittedly imperfect, was necessary to regularize the status of migratory workers and provide some minimal protection to those individuals.

At the same time, advocates of the Bracero program among the United States delegation indicated that this view was not presently shared by a majority of their colleagues in the Congress. While U.S. Congressmen and Senators from agricultural border states favored the idea, organized labor remained adamantly opposed. Legislators from the industrial North and East reflected that opposition—which was also based on a genuine humanitarian concern for the plight of the Mexican workers. In the light of these divergent viewpoints, United States delegates urged that the Bracero issue be discussed in subsequent meetings between labor representatives of Mexico and the

United States with a view toward increasing mutual understanding of the realities involved.

Both delegations also expressed the hope that the April meeting of the Mexican and United States commissions (referred to above) would fully consider the migratory worker problem and arrive at concrete recommendations for resolution of same; pending such resolution, both delegations expressed the hope that legislatively the status quo would be maintained.

In this regard, reference was made to legislative proposals in the United States Congress, such as the Rodino bill, which would impose criminal penalties on employers hiring illegal aliens. Although the Rodino bill passed the House on two separate occasions, action in the Senate has been deferred pending the completion of a study on the practical effects of the legislation.

In the meantime, a United States delegate observed, the United States Supreme Court had sustained a California state law similar to the Rodino proposal. The overall effect of this ruling, he believed, would be to discourage the employment of Mexicans, especially in doubtful or borderline cases.

In conclusion, members of the United States delegation agreed that Congressional opponents of the Rodino bill and similar legislation were presently in the minority and that a strong effort would have to be mounted if that opposition were to prove effective.

Education, Science, and Culture

Several Mexican delegates stressed the importance of education in improving human, political and social relations among all peoples. In the case of neighboring countries like the United States and Mexico education in neighborliness should be encouraged in order to promote that which unites the two countries and to eliminate that which divides them. To that end it was suggested that bilingual education be encouraged; that attention be accorded to the similarity of both countries' struggles for freedom; and that the peoples of the two countries be informed about one another from the geographic, historic, human and artistic standpoints.

In a broader context, members of the Mexican delegation pointed to the establishment of a Third World University which would soon open in Mexico City—pursuant to the recommendations of a UNESCO declaration. The goals of this institution, they stated, were to: (1) contribute to the integral development of man and society; (2) to identify problems and suggest viable solutions; (3) to obtain fairer terms of trade on the basis of sovereign equality; and (4) to expand cooperation among nations in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

United States delegates expressed considerable interest in these proposals. The United States Chairman observed that one of the practical barriers to the educational goals set forth above was lack of equal educational opportunity available to many Mexican-Americans. For instance, despite a severe doctor shortage in the United States (estimated at approximately 50,000 vacancies), degrees from Mexican educational institutions—especially schools of medicine and dentistry—were still not being recognized in the United States. The Chairman urged the Mexican legislators to press for reciprocity in this

regard. Another United States delegate observed that education is also an important vehicle for cultural exchange and pointed out that he was sending his own son and daughter to Mexico in the future for further study at Mexican educational institutions.

Both delegations agreed that the exchange of technicians between the two countries could be usefully expanded. A Mexican delegate observed, for instance, that only eight Mexicans were presently assigned to the United States under this program and only seven Americans were similarly engaged in Mexico; clearly, this number should be increased.

United States delegates cited recent developments in solar energy—for the heating of homes in small communities—and in desalinization—to combat a serious water shortage which threatens regions of both countries—as examples of fields in which the sharing of technology could be of mutual benefit.

One United States delegate described a specific and current case history of water pollution involving the northward flow of sewage from Mexicali in Baja California to San Diego, California. While the Mexican government has assumed full responsibility for instituting corrective action, and had made some initial progress, the problem had been exacerbated by the natural increase in the population of the Mexicali community. It was suggested, therefore, as in other situations of this kind, that the ultimate solution might well be in the form of an international project to be undertaken by the International Boundary Commission.

Finally, the respective Chairmen of the two delegations expressed full agreement on the usefulness of the Interparliamentary mechanism for increasing mutual understanding of these often complex problems and respect for the positions of both countries in international affairs.

IV. Joint Statement by Heads of Delegations

At the conclusion of the 16th Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, the Chairmen of the respective delegations agreed on the following.

DECLARATIONS

On the occasion of the United States Bicentennial both delegations to the 16th Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference paid a heartfelt tribute to the Founding Fathers and praised their work in support of the principles of freedom, equality and justice which are the cornerstones of political life in the United States.

The delegations committed themselves to working for a better understanding between the peoples whom they represent, with the aim of overcoming any obstacle which might detract from the respectful and cordial relations which exist between the United States and Mexico.

In reiterating their confidence in the usefulness of the Interparliamentary Meetings, they agreed to designate two joint committees, one to draft a summary report of the 16 meetings which have been held, and another to draw up a document which will include some concrete proposals to be presented to Presidents Ford and Echeverria, who have expressed their interest in the work of the Conference and in proposals adopted by both delegations.

Views on the United Nations

The United Nations is an important instrument for the preservation of peace and the establishment of a new economic order.

The United Nations Committee entrusted with reviewing that organization's Charter should suggest measures to strengthen it, if such action is required in order to achieve the organization's objectives.

The heads of the delegations reiterated their support for the principle of the territorial integrity of all nations and non-intervention in the political affairs of other states.

Organization of American States

The Organization of American States continues to be the most important forum for exchanging views among all the states of the Western Hemisphere.

Members of the OAS should make a concerted effort to adapt the Organization to the political requirements of our time.

The OAS should be a more effective instrument for solidarity and cooperation among all the countries of the Hemisphere.

Narcotics

The issue of illicit narcotics is a problem multilateral in nature and concerns the entire community of nations.

Both delegations expressed satisfaction as to the measures and efforts adopted and undertaken in their respective countries to suppress the production, traffic and use of illicit drugs.

The United States delegation expressed its gratitude for the efforts undertaken by the government and the people of Mexico in their war on narcotics traffic.

Both delegations indicated their approval of President Echeverria's proposal to create twin commissions in Mexico and the United States to coordinate and intensify efforts with respect to the elimination of the drug problem.

Recommendation was made that both delegations consider the establishment of a standing legislative committee to review progress on this issue during the interim period between Interparliamentary Meetings.

The Mexican delegation expressed its concern about the fact that some states in the United States no longer penalize the consumption of marijuana, even though these states continue to prohibit the sale of it.

Law of the Sea

There should be a redoubling of efforts to reach agreement on all outstanding Law of the Sea issues.

Coastal states have a right to protect maritime resources close to their coasts, as recognized by legislative measures recently approved by both Mexico and the United States, respectively.

The community of nations is approaching a consensus on the issue of exclusive economic zones.

Protection of Human Rights

The subject of "Protection of Human Rights" was covered thoroughly. The delegates exchanged views on the treatment afforded their fellow citizens and reiterated their faith in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

In referring to Americans subject to trial in Mexico and to Mexican migratory workers in the United States, the delegates presented detailed explanations of these issues and proposed that recommendations be made that their governments make every effort to guarantee that the human rights of all are fully protected.

Democracy in the Western Hemisphere

Both delegations agreed that democracy and the functioning of democratic institutions are the best social and political means to guarantee the freedom and rights of man, since they constitute the most effective way to halt the advance of totalitarianism.

Similarly, both delegations expressed their firm hope for the reestablishment of representative democracy and democratic institutions in those countries where they have been suppressed.

Desalinization Plant

Renewed interest was expressed in the construction of a nuclear desalinization plant in Baja, California. Both governments should move ahead with this project as soon as they are satisfied that all technical difficulties can be eliminated. The construction of such a plant will be of great benefit to both countries.

Inflation and Development

The Mexican and United States delegations expressed their joint concern over the worldwide effects of inflation and agreed that this problem can only be solved in a multilateral framework.

The industrialized and underdeveloped countries have a common interest in promoting and expanding international trade and in removing, to the extent possible, the barriers which presently exist to the free movement of goods and agricultural products across national boundaries. An important goal in this respect is to insure fair and stable prices for manufactured goods and for raw materials produced by the developing nations.

The legislators of both countries agreed on the desirability of increasing the flow of U.S. investment to Mexico, which is consistent with Mexican law. The American delegates emphasized that past nationalization actions of the Mexican Government had always been accompanied by payment of fair compensation. Mexico, in the U.S. view, serves as a model of international responsibility in this regard.

At the request of the Mexican legislators, members of the United States delegation agreed to discuss with the Executive Branch of the United States Government the desirability of implementing those provisions of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States which both governments favor.

Commerce, Tourism and Balance of Payments

Both delegations agreed that a liberalization of the two countries' bilateral trade policies, in accordance with the principle of reciprocity, was clearly desirable. The United States delegates, in particular, acknowledged the need to take Mexican economic interests fully into account in the implementation of the U.S. Trade Reform Act of 1974. The Mexican delegation urged favorable trade consideration be accorded Mexico in the light of Mexico's trade deficit and geographical location. The Mexican delegation noted that preferential treatment for neighboring countries has been accepted in principle by the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade).

Generalized System of Preferences

The United States delegation accorded sympathetic consideration to the concerns expressed by the Mexican delegation over certain provisions of the Trade Reform Act. While cognizant of these concerns and apprehensions on the part of Latin American governments the U.S. delegates noted that the benefits of GSP to Mexico were not inconsiderable. The U.S. delegates also pointed out that to date the Trade Act's "escape-clause" provisions (including anti-dumping measures and countervailing duties) had rarely been invoked and expressed the hope that recourse to such measures in the future would be minimal.

Regional Integration

The American legislators were entirely sympathetic to efforts of Latin American countries to promote regional economic integration, such as the Latin American Economic System (SELA). The U.S. delegates accepted Mexican legislators' assurances that such efforts were designed to promote international cooperation, not confrontation, and noted that official U.S. policy favors the concept.

Undocumented Migratory Workers

In an attempt to emphasize their fundamental belief that work and the desire to obtain work is an inalienable human right and legitimate human aspiration, both delegations agreed that the term "undocumented worker" is preferable to that of "illegal immigrant." Both delegations recognized the need for providing protection to Mexican workers in the United States and for insuring that they receive equal treatment under the law.

While both delegations recognized that in long-range terms, economic progress within Mexico will be a key to the resolution of the migratory worker problem—as enunciated on several occasions by President Luis Echeverria—several U.S. delegates expressed the view that conclusion of a new "Bracero" program would be desirable in the short term. Such a program, although imperfect, would be preferable for both countries, it was felt, than the non-regulated situation which now prevails.

In this connection, the U.S. legislators noted the opposition of organized labor in the United States to such a program and urged that this problem be discussed in subsequent meetings between labor representatives of Mexico and the United States.

Both delegations expressed the hope that the forthcoming April meeting to be assembled by the governments of the respective countries of the United States and Mexico would fully consider the problem and arrive at concrete recommendations for the resolution of same and that pending such resolution, it was the hope that legislatively the status quo should be maintained.

Education, Science and Culture

The Interparliamentary delegations recognize the universal character of education, science and culture and believe that they are the best means to guarantee the improvement of human, political and social relations among all peoples. They consider, likewise, that to be relevant to the requirements of our time, education should include the study of such concepts as democracy, freedom, independence and social justice. The delegations believe that in the case of neighboring

countries, specifically Mexico and the United States of America, education in neighborliness should be provided in order to promote that which unites us and to eliminate that which divides us. To that end, they suggest that bilingual education be encouraged; that attention be accorded to the similarity of our struggles for freedom; and that the peoples of our respective countries be informed about one another from the geographic, historic, human and artistic standpoints.

The delegations of both countries believe that the bulwark of peace is the mind of man. The Mexican delegation, citing a UNESCO declaration, indicated that the time had come to promote the establishment of international institutions of education, such as the Third World University, which will soon open in Mexico. The goals of such institutions, they pointed out, are: (1) to contribute to the integral development of man and society; (2) to identify problems and suggest viable solutions; (3) to obtain fairer terms of trade on the basis of sovereign equality; and (4) to expand cooperation among nations in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

The United States delegates expressed considerable interest in this proposal and promised to give it very serious consideration.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A

Welcoming Statement by the Honorable George Busbee, Governor of Georgia, 16th Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, Atlanta, Ga.

Senator Mansfield, Senator Olivares Santana and distinguished members of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference.

I appreciate your invitation and am pleased to be able to be with you this morning. On behalf of all Georgians, I would like to welcome you to our beautiful State, and particularly to the great city of Atlanta.

Since the establishment of the Conference in 1960, your annual meetings have been held in many fine cities. It is especially fitting that you have chosen Atlanta, Georgia, for this 1976 meeting.

Atlanta is rapidly gaining worldwide recognition as a center for foreign exchange in the areas of government, commerce, banking and culture.

In less than six months, the world spotlight will be directed to the very heart of this city with the opening of the Georgia World Congress Center which will combine exhibition space, meeting rooms, simultaneous translation facilities, food service, and international telephone service in one single building.

There is nothing else like it in the world, and I sincerely hope you will have an opportunity to return to Atlanta after its opening for similar foreign exchanges.

The World Congress Center is just one of the exciting developments going on in Atlanta at the present time but one of which I am most proud.

In readying ourselves for the future we have tried to mold a city and a State which are both accessible to, and capable of providing services for, a wide spectrum of business, industry and government throughout the world.

As chief executive of this State I am keenly interested in quality education, and the economic development of Georgia.

Through our statewide international efforts, we have been able to develop an extensive network of worldwide governmental, industry and business contracts.

Georgia is one of the few States in the country with as many as four overseas offices. They are located in Brussels, Belgium; Tokyo, Japan; Sao Paulo, Brazil; and Toronto, Canada.

During my first year in office, I conducted three trade missions overseas—going to Western Europe, the Far East, and Mexico.

While in Mexico last April, I was privileged to meet with Emilio Rabasa, Minister of Foreign Relations. We toured the outstanding

Mexican Institute of Foreign Trade Exhibition which had a most impressive array of quality Mexican products. We also talked extensively of the possibilities of opening a Mexican office in Georgia.

I am happy to report that as a result of this very successful trade mission to Mexico, we now boast a fulltime Mexican Consulate in Georgia headed by Consul Alexander Hungler. The addition of the Mexican Consulate brings the number of fulltime consulates in Georgia to eight in addition to the 30 honorary consuls who are also here.

To round out Georgia's excellent potential for international growth and exchange we also have—

One of the most aggressive and active Ports Authorities in the country; and

We are now in the process of establishing the state's first Foreign Trade Zone.

Altogether there are presently more than 180 international firms in operation in Georgia—employing 15,000 people—with a total of $160 million in investments in manufacturing facilities, and over $136 million in non-manufacturing foreign real estate acquisitions.

The importance of the trade missions, however, has reached far beyond merely being part of an aggressive economic development program.

They have been a most beneficial learning experience for me as Governor.

I have learned how international business leaders view my state and region from an economic and growth standpoint, and I am proud to note their conclusions are most positive.

I have also learned first hand of the close interrelationships which exist among the nations of the world. We are indeed an international community, and this neighborhood will grow closer through the coming years.

We in Georgia are proud of our worldwide friendships, and especially of our relationship with Mexico.

As neighbors in the Western Hemisphere, we have a great opportunity to work together to find solutions to our long range needs and the immediate problems we share.

Our scales of observation will necessarily differ—my perspective is as a governor representing 4½ million people. You are senators and congressmen representing specific constituencies, and in the capacity of this Conference, you represent your nation's government.

Our individual goals are the same—to insure the best for our people, and to strive for world peace.

The goals of this Conference are to discuss common problems in the interests of relations between the United States and Mexico, and to foster a closer relationship among the peoples of our lands.

All of these goals are directly related to the degree of understanding which exists among our citizens.

We share much in common, and we have a great deal to learn from, and with, each other. We have come to live our lives together, and the success of our personal futures, and the future of our countries are intertwined.

I applaud you for your work on this Conference. Your responsibility is great, and the issues you deal with are extremely important, and some are controversial.

But you are here to work for the common good of our citizens, and to provide insight to our respective countries on policies and trends which dramatically affect our future.

Thank you for this opportunity to meet with you. Come back and visit us again soon, and best wishes for a successful meeting.

Appendix B

Opening Plenary Statement by Hon. E. (Kika) de la Garza[1]

Governor Busbee, our very distinguished colleagues—the delegates from Mexico, my colleagues of the U.S. House and Senate, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

It is my great honor and distinct privilege to welcome you to the opening plenary session of the 16th Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference.

1976, as you know, is a very special year for us in the United States. It is a year in which we celebrate the 200th anniversary of our Independence—Yes, this is a very special birthday for our country. We want to make it also a very special year for our Mexican guests and for our conference.

Once again, as we initiate our labors, we have a full and challenging agenda of topics to discuss, both of a bilateral and multilateral nature. Some issues we have dealt with before; others are new. All, I believe, are of importance to our relations as friends and neighbors, hence merit—and I am sure will receive—our best efforts.

We note that our deliberations have now transcended from purely bilateral issues and problems to those which are not limited to us, but go beyond our two countries and even our hemisphere. We will be discussing, and I think very appropriately so in this our bicentennial, the direction and development of democracy and democratic institutions in the Western Hemisphere.

It is with some degree of pride that I mention that here in these United States of America was born that novel experiment of liberty, of freedom and dignity for the individual, of equality and justice under the law, of government by the consent of the governed. It is not perfect, it has its failings—really not of the system but of the people—for when you deal with humans, there is always the capacity to err. But it is well to remind ourselves and our friends that Washington and Jefferson and Madison, Franklin, and Mason gave us a simple piece of paper, the Declaration of Independence, followed by a Bill of Rights and a Constitution * * *. And now 200 years later, I think even beyond their dearest wish or expectation, here we are with the same Bill of Rights, the same Constitution—amended, yes,

[1] Mr. de la Garza's remarks were delivered in Spanish, and lose some of their original flavor in this rather free translation.

but done so in a manner the document itself suggests. I think it would be well to remember, and I do so in honor of our Mexican colleagues, that the same yearning for independence, that same spark that would light the fires of freedom, had been ignited in the hearts of noble people in what are now Mexico and other countries of the Western Hemisphere * * *. And it was not long after Washington and Philadelphia that we heard "El Grito de Dolores", and the world knew of Hidalgo and the many other Mexican patriots, including Dona Josefa Ortiz de Dominguez.

It is well to remember that many of our ancestors and many of our states, including my own state of Texas—and even part of yours, Senator Mansfield—were not a part of the cry for independence of Philadelphia, but rather of "El Grito de Dolores", for all the lands west of the Mississippi were a part of New Spain.

Fate, divergence of opinion amongst people, and eventually war made us a part of the United States of America, but many of us never stopped being brothers with our neighbors to the south; and I want my Mexican colleagues to carry this message back to your people: We are your brothers, we are your friends—many times misunderstood—but even then we remain dedicated to that initial link of brotherhood.

I do not think it is necessary to recall facts, but history bears this out: Neither you nor the rest of the world need fear any yearning of our people for power or domain. All one needs to do is look around—look at Germany and Japan; we conquered them both after a great war. They signed unconditional surrender, but now they are our competitors in the markets of the world. Yes, we make mistakes (I told you of the human capacity to err), but the American people have this great power to reconciliation, for sometimes the failings are of the government and not necessarily of the people. We invaded your country, our ships landed troops upon your shores * * * and not too many years later, one of our mightiest aircraft carriers was at Tampico after a hurricane * * * landing troops, yes, but to save lives of your countrymen, our brothers. In the border country where I come from, we live as brothers—we do so daily, perhaps because we are so far from Washington and Mexico City.

The language, the customs, the culture, the architecture, the music, the names—all remain, and we acknowledge them with pride. Many of our public institutions and private businesses fly the American flag, the Texas flag, and the Mexican flag side by side—this in the United States of America, yes, in the United States of America, so often chastised for having no concern for others, or their institutions.

But let me turn for a few brief moments to what we do here * * *. It is with some degree of sadness that I attend this conference, for I know it will be the last for many of our Mexican colleagues who finish their terms of office this year. We have worked together, we have become personal friends * * *. Yes, we have made friendships that will last for many years, but let us look at what we have accomplished in these sixteen years, look at the items that will *not* be discussed. That, I think, should be our greatest tribute, for it has been at these conferences that we have hammered out in theory and in principle what our executive branches have later incorporated into treaties and protocols—Chamizal, El Rio Colorado to name but two. We have worked side by side, as friends and neighbors, and we have achieved. So now let us look to the future, let us continue. There will be others who will

come, as others came before you, but these years in which this group has worked together have been fruitful years, both personally and for our two countries. We have made both of our countries better places in which to live; we have learned about our respective peoples; we have discussed our differences and carried forward our agreements.

Yes, both you, my Mexican colleagues, and we have carried the banners of our countries high—with respect, and dignity, and love. We salute you.

I would like to close with a special tribute to the Mexican people via a personal anecdote: It was during hurricane Beulah in 1967. The great floods which came after the storm inundated many communities on both sides of the river. Our military came into the area and assisted all who needed help. There was no border—all were taken to high ground regardless of which side of the river they inhabited. Almost all of the city of Camargo, on the Mexican side, was under water; so all of the people were brought to our side, to Rio Grande City and Roma. They were taken to schools, churches, private homes—wherever they could be cared for. Governor John Connally came down; then President Lyndon B. Johnson arrived. I had been there all the time. As we were going through a school where the people were being cared for and fed, I was translating for President Johnson as he spoke to the people from Mexico * * *.

We reached a family which, I could tell, was of very humble economic resources. President Johnson asked the lady how they were being cared for, and she replied "real well"; and he asked about her children, were they being fed?—and she replied "yes, thank you." I then asked her if she knew who this man was, and she said no * * *. I told her he was the President of the United States, and immediately she stood up and stood her children up. President Johnson then told her: "I am a very good friend of your President Diaz Ordaz." This very humble Mexican woman, with her arms around her children, told me: "Please tell the President that in the name of our President, Don Gustavo Diaz Ordaz and of all our countrymen here, I give him thanks and that if God permits him some day to come to Camargo, he has there a humble home."

It is in that spirit, my colleagues, that I say to you: We cannot change the past, but we and this conference have enhanced the present, both for our two countries and for the world, and there is no limit to what can be accomplished in the future. It may be by others, but we have paved the way. So in this 16th session, let us leave an indelible mark, enabling us to respond with pride to those who would ask what has been done: "Look around you" * * * A better world, a better Mexico, a better United States—and that we have achieved this as brothers * * * that shall be our monument!

Appendix C

Remarks by Senator Mike Mansfield at the Closing Plenary Session XVI, Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, Atlanta, Ga.

Senator Olivares, Deputy Rodriguez, Congressman de la Garza, fellow Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I want to take this opportunity to thank Governor and Mrs. Busbee

for the many courtesies they have extended to us. We particularly appreciate Governor Busbee taking time out of his busy schedule to be with us during the opening plenary session of the Conference.

Similarly, I want to thank Mayor Jackson and his office for their help and assistance here in Atlanta.

* * * * * * *

The City of Atlanta. The modernity of this City almost belies its historical antecedents, and yet, there is a marvelous balance between the old and the new; Atlanta sports a traditional elegance that few cities can match—but combined with a functionalism that belongs to the 21st Century.

Atlanta has learned to live with itself: it jealously protects its rich Southern heritage. It thoroughly enjoys the present. And it realistically plans for the future.

The people of Atlanta, we salute you. And we thank you for making our stay here a very enjoyable one.

Southern hospitality is alive and well. And its hometown is Atlanta.

* * * * * * *

At this point, Ladies and Gentlemen, let me assure you that I will not follow in the footsteps of the O. Henry character who professed he had nothing to say and then proceeded to "* * * talk till the sun went down and the chickens went to roost." I will be brief.

I have had the honor of speaking at many of these closing sessions and I appreciate the opportunity to do so once again.

Because of the timing of this year's conference, I want to thank Senator Olivares, Deputy Rodriguez and the entire Mexican delegation for their cooperation and help in holding our meeting earlier in the year than is customary. It is the kind of cooperation and help that we have come to expect from each other; it is the kind of cooperation and help that stands as a lasting tribute to our annual meetings; and it is the kind of cooperation and help that contributes to greater understanding and to strengthening the bonds of friendship between our countries. Indeed, it is the kind of cooperation and help that diplomats dream of and poets write about.

We have forged this relationship in just sixteen short years and we have established a record of which all of us can be justifiably proud.

It is a record which has stood and will continue to stand the test of time; it is a record established not of necessity, but of desire—a desire to learn, to understand, to speak to each other with respect for our differences and appreciation for our similarities.

Respect and appreciation—they have served as the guiding hand for our meetings—and they have served well. This year we ploughed through an agenda comprised of thirteen major items, ranging from the United Nations to migratory workers; from law of the sea to the Trade Reform Act; from efforts to deal with the flow of narcotic drugs to integration and regional economic development.

We did not subject each topic to exhaustive debate or tedious examination. Nor did we attempt to negotiate our differences. Rather, we have listened and learned. We have gained new insights. We have broadened our horizons. And despite our differences, or perhaps because of them, all of us are better for having been here.

We may not see eye to eye on the United Nations issue, for example, but all of us believe in the need for such an organization and the rule of international law.

We may have different views on the law of the sea, but all of us believe in the need for an international agreement that will prevent the mindless exploitation of the seas and will serve to benefit all mankind.

We may not agree on the specific details designed to implement the Trade Act of 1974, but we all agree on the need to expand international trade and improve the economic well-being of all nations.

Our objectives are the same. Our approaches are quite often different. This is as it should be, because each nation defines its own self-interests—and therein lies the opportunity for cooperation.

Mexico and the United States have seized this opportunity on many occasions. Such opportunities culminated, for example, in the Chamizal Settlement of 1971 and the Colorado River Salinity Agreement of 1973. They are proud testament to the shared desire that our actions match our words. And indeed they have.

Fellow delegates and distinguished guests: Let me close on a sort of bicentennial note.

About 200 years ago, March 23, 1775, to be precise, Patrick Henry was moved to say, "I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know no way of judging the future but by the past."

If Patrick Henry was right, and I think it is fair to say that he was right about a lot of things, then the experience we have gathered during the past sixteen years casts a bright and illuminating future for the next sixteen.

Appendix D

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

At the time of the filing of this report, the estimated total of the Senate delegation's official expenses for the 16th Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference came to approximately $20,000. A consolidated report showing all expenditures of the delegation at the conference will be filed later with the Senate in accordance with law.

○

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
3 1262 09113 1622